arXiv:1703.01356v1 [cs.LO] 3 Mar 2017

INDUCING SYNTACTIC CUT-ELIMINATION FOR INDEXED NESTED SEQUENTS *

REVANTHA RAMANAYAKE

Technische Universität Wien, Vienna, Austria.
e-mail address: revantha@logic.at

Abstract. The key to the proof-theoretical study of a logic is a cutfree proof calculus. Unfortunately there are many logics of interest lacking suitable proof calculi. The proof formalism of nested sequents was recently generalised to indexed nested sequents in order to yield cutfree proof calculi for extensions of the modal logic K by Geach (Lemmon-Scott) axioms. The proofs of completeness and cut-elimination therein were semantical and intricate. Here we identify a subclass of the labelled sequent formalism and show that it corresponds to the indexed nested sequent formalism. This correspondence is then exploited to induce syntactic proofs for indexed nested sequents using the elegant existing proofs in the labelled sequent formalism. A larger goal of this work is to demonstrate how specialising existing proof-theoretical transformations (adapting these as required to remain within the subclass) is an alternative means of argument which can alleviate the need for independent proofs from 'scratch' in each formalism. Moreover, such coercion can be used to induce new cutfree calculi. We demonstrate by presenting the first indexed nested sequent calculi for intermediate logics. Finally, we introduce a notion of duplicate subgraph using certain graph automorphisms—generalising the notion of contraction for labelled sequents whose underlying structure is more general than trees—yielding a normal form for derivations. We envisage that such notions might be employed in order to prove decidability of a logic using its restricted labelled calculus.

1. Introduction

Gentzen [11] introduced the *sequent calculus* as an elegant formal proof system for classical and intuitionistic logics. The sequent calculus consists of axioms (initial sequents) and rules built from *traditional sequents* of the form $X \vdash Y$ where X and Y are formula multisets (formula lists in the original formulation). The rule of *modus ponens* below is present in most of the logics of interest.

$$\frac{A \qquad A \to B}{B}\ \textit{modus ponens}$$

This rule has a great drawback; it violates the *subformula property* which states that every formula in the premise of a rule is a (sub)formula of some formula in the conclusion of the rule. When every rule in the proof system satisfies the subformula property, then the

Key words and phrases: proof theory, cut-elimination, labelled sequents, nested sequents, modal logic, intermediate logics.

* This is an extended version of the conference paper [20].

Supported by the Austrian Science Fund (FWF), START project Y544.

LOGICAL METHODS
IN COMPUTER SCIENCE
DOI:10.2168/LMCS-???
© Revantha Ramanayake
Creative Commons

only formulae that may appear in a proof (derivation) are the subformulae of the formula that is being proved. Thus the subformula property places a strong restriction on the set of possible derivations of a given formula. In fact, the subformula property is critical for enabling elegant and constructive proof-theoretic arguments of logical properties such as consistency, decidability, complexity and interpolation.

In order to retain the expressivity of *modus ponens* while obtaining a proof system with the subformula property, Gentzen first generalised the form of his proof rules. For example, *modus ponens* was generalised to the cut-rule below.

$$\frac{X \vdash Y, A \qquad A, U \vdash V}{X, U \vdash Y, V}\ \text{cut}$$

Using the calculus with the generalised rules, Genzen proved his celebrated *cut-elimination theorem* which shows how to eliminate the cut-rule from any proof (derivation) in the sequent calculus, in effect showing that the cut-rule is redundant. He then made use of this result to give a proof of the consistency of arithmetic under a suitable induction principle.

Following the seminal work of Gentzen—and recognising its proof-theoretic importance—efforts were made to obtain sequent calculi with the subformula property for the many logics of interest. Unfortunately the sequent calculus formalism does not permit adequate generalisation of the proof rules to permit cut-elimination for most non-classical logics . In response, various generalisations of the sequent calculus formalism have been proposed.

Nested sequent. calculus [14, 2] is a popular proof formalism that has been used to present intuitionistic logic [7], conditional logics [18], logics in the classical and intuitionistic modal cube [14, 22, 15] and path axiom extensions of classical modal logic [12]. The idea is to use a *tree* of traditional sequents as the basic building block rather than just a single traditional sequent. The tree structure is encoded using the nesting of $[\cdots]$ and comma. Here are some examples:

$$X \vdash Y, [P \vdash Q, [U \vdash V], [L \vdash M]], [S \vdash T] \tag{1.1}$$

$$X \vdash Y, [U \vdash V, [L \vdash M], [S \vdash T]] \tag{1.2}$$

The preceeding two nested sequents can thus be depicted graphically as a (finite directed rooted) tree whose nodes are decorated by traditional sequents.





Definition 1.1 (Geach logics and axioms)**.** A *Geach* logic is an axiomatic extension of the normal modal logic K by (Geach) axioms of the form:

$$G(h, i, j, k) := \Diamond^h \Box^i p \to \Box^j \Diamond^k p \quad (h, i, j, k \geq 0) \tag{1.3}$$

There are no known nested sequent calculi for the general class of Geach logics.

Indexed nested sequents. are a recent extension of nested sequents introduced by Fitting [5] to obtain calculi for the Geach logics. An indexed nested sequent is obtained by assigning an index to each traditional sequent in the nested sequent and permitting multiple traditional sequents to possess the same index. The following are examples of indexed nested sequents:

$$X \vdash^0 Y, [P \vdash^1 Q, [U \vdash^2 V], [L \vdash^3 M]], [S \vdash^3 T] \tag{1.4}$$

$$X \vdash^0 Y, [P \vdash^1 Q, [U \vdash^0 V], [L \vdash^1 M]], [S \vdash^2 T] \tag{1.5}$$

As before we can present an indexed nested sequent as a tree whose nodes are decorated with a traditional sequent and an index (first two graphs below).



Viewing an indexed nested sequent as above does not bring us anything new. The key to obtaining more expressivity is to interpret those nodes of the tree with the same index ($\Gamma_1 \vdash^n \Delta_1, \ldots, \Gamma_{N+1} \vdash^n \Delta_{N+1}$, say) as a *single* node decorated with $\Gamma_1, \ldots, \Gamma_{N+1} \vdash \Delta_1, \ldots, \Delta_{N+1}$.[1] Thus indexed nested sequents correspond to *directed graphs* obtained by conflating certain nodes of a tree. The indexed nested sequents (1.4) and (1.5) are depicted by the two rightmost graphs above.

Fitting does not prove syntactic cut-elimination for his indexed nested sequent calculi for Geach logics, but instead establishes that the calculus minus the cut-rule is complete with respect to the corresponding logic's semantics. Such a proof is called a *semantic proof of cut-elimination* and contrasts with the syntactic proofs à la Gentzen where the elimination of cuts is constructive.

Apart from the technical interest in syntactic proofs of cut-elimination (after all, proof-theory is concerned primarily with the syntax), such proofs yield a constructive procedure and the cutfree derivation is related in a formal sense to the original derivation. However, the downside of syntactic proofs is that they tend to be highly technical and difficult to verify. We believe that the best response is to resuse and adapt whenever possible those syntactic proofs that are already in existence rather than presenting new proofs from scratch. In this paper, we show syntactic cut-elimination for the indexed nested sequent calculi for Geach logics by inducing the existing results for labelled sequent calculi.

Labelled sequents. [6, 16] generalise the traditional sequent by the prefixing of *state variables* to formulae occurring in the sequent. A labelled sequent has the form $\mathcal{R}, X \vdash Y$ where the *relation mset* (multiset) $\mathcal{R}$ consists of terms of the form Rxy. Meanwhile X and Y are multisets of labelled formulae (e.g. $x : A \to B$, $y : p$). A labelled sequent can be viewed as a directed graph (defined using the set $\mathcal{R}$) with sequents at each node [21].

Negri [17] has presented a method for generating cutfree and contraction-free labelled sequent calculi for the large family of modal logics whose Kripke semantics are defined by geometric (first-order) formulae. The proof of cut-elimination is general in the sense that

[1] Of course, this interpretation needs to be justified. This is shown in Sec. 3–5. Here we want to provide an intuition for these objects.

it applies uniformly to every modal logic defined by geometric formulae. This result has been extended to labelled sequent calculi for intermediate and other non-classical logics [3] and indeed to arbitrary first-order formulae [4]. See also Viganò [24] where non-classical logics with semantics defined by Horn formulae are investigated using cutfree labelled calculi introduced therein.

It is well-known that every modal logic obtained by the addition of Geach axioms to K can be defined semantically using the geometric formulae. For example, the logic $K+\Diamond\Box p \to \Box\Diamond p$ is the logic whose Kripke frames satisfy the geometric formula $\forall xyz(Rxy \wedge Rxz \longrightarrow \exists u(Ryu \wedge Rzu))$.

Labelled tree sequents. (LTS) are a special instance of the labelled sequent that are *isomorphic up to state variable names* [13] to the nested sequent (an isomorphism with prefixed tableaux has also been shown [7]). The idea is to impose restrictions on the relation mset of a labelled sequent $\mathcal{R}, X \vdash Y$ to ensure that the directed graph defined by $\mathcal{R}$ is a tree. For example, the nested sequents (1.1) and (1.2) correspond to the LTS

$$\underbrace{Rxy, Rxz, Ryu, Ryv}_{\text{relation mset}}, x : X, y : P, z : S, u : U, v : L \vdash x : Y, y : Q, z : T, u : V, v : M$$

$$\overbrace{Rxy, Ryu, Ryv}, x : X, y : U, u : L, v : S \vdash x : Y, y : V, u : M, v : T$$

The isomorphism will be more transparent to the reader if he/she consults the trees that we presented following (1.1) and (1.2). In particular, the relation msets above define those trees and the labelled formulae multisets specify where to place the multisets on the tree. The extension of the isomorphism to nested sequent and labelled tree sequent calculi was used [13] to answer a question [19] concerning the relationship between two distinct proof calculi.

In this work. we use a technical extension[2] introduced in Negri [17] to write a labelled sequent as $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{E}, X \vdash Y$ where $\mathcal{E}$ consists of terms of the form $x = y$. In this formulation of a labelled sequent, a labelled tree sequent has $\mathcal{R}$ defining a tree and $\mathcal{E} = \emptyset$. We then characterise indexed nested sequents as labelled sequents where $\mathcal{R}$ is a tree but $\mathcal{E}$ is not forced to be empty. We call such sequents *labelled tree sequents with equality* (LTSE). We prove syntactic cut-elimination (Section 3) and soundness and completeness for rule extensions of LTSE-calculi with respect to Geach logics (Section 4). We then lift the map between indexed nested sequents and LTSE to calculi built from these sequents. In this way we develop the technical machinery mentioned by Fitting in [5] as 'a significant different direction' in the study of indexed nested sequents.

The results of [13] relating nested sequent and LTS calculi was restricted by the fact that the crucial substitution lemma does not hold for the latter. We show here that a nuanced substitution lemma does hold for LTSE calculi. Using this result we induce general results from labelled sequent calculi to LTSE calculi. The situation is delicate as it is necessary to remain within the LTSE-fragment at all times. In this way we efficiently obtain the first syntactic proof of cut-elimination (and hence completeness) for the indexed nested sequent calculi, reusing existing results and alleviating the need for new, independent proofs. We then extend these results to introduce indexed nested sequent calculi for propositional

[2]The equality relation facilitates the mapping with indexed nested sequents. In any case, the equality terms can be 'compiled away' to obtain a standard labelled sequent.

intermediate logics i.e. logics extending intuitionistic logic. We are not aware of any existing nested sequent calculi for intermediate logics.

Viewing a labelled sequent as a labelled graph, in Section 7 we identify certain graph automorphisms which generalise the notion of contraction. We make use of this notion of 'duplicate subgraph' to give a normal form for labelled derivations. When the labelled graph satisfies certain properties (as do the labelled sequents in the calculus for $K + \Diamond\Diamond\Diamond p \to \Diamond p$, for example) the breadth of the graph is shown to be bounded relative to its depth. We envisage that such notions might be employed in order to prove decidability of a logic using its restricted labelled calculus.

2. Preliminaries

The set of natural numbers is denoted by $\mathbb{N}$. We assume a set $\{p, q, r, \ldots\}$ of propositional variables. A formula in the language of classical or intermediate logic is either a propositional variable or the logical constants $\bot, \top$ or has the form $A \star B$ where A and B are formulae and $\star \in \{\vee, \wedge, \to\}$. The language of modal logic has formula $\Box A$ whenever A is a formula. The size of a formula is the sum of the number of connectives and propositional variables and logical constants it contains.

Assume that we have at our disposal an infinite set $\mathbb{SV} = \{x_1, x_2, \ldots\}$ of *state variables* disjoint from the set of propositional variables. A *labelled formula* has the form $x : A$ where $x \in \mathbb{SV}$ and A is a formula. If $X = \{A_1, \ldots A_n\}$ is a formula multiset, then $x : X$ denotes the multiset $\{x : A_1, \ldots, x : A_n\}$ of labelled formulae. Notice that if the formula multiset X is empty, then the labelled formula multiset $x : X$ is also empty.

In this paper we discuss several different types of sequents. The following definitions are standard. A *rule* is a sequence of sequents of some type, typically written as $(s_1, \ldots, s_N / s_{N+1})$. The sequent s_{N+1} is called the *conclusion* of the rule, the remaining sequents are called the *premises* of the rule. If $N = 0$ then the rule is called an *initial sequent*. A calculus consists of a finite set of rules. A derivation in the calculus is defined recursively as either an initial sequent or the object obtained by applying a rule ρ in the calculus to smaller derivations whose bottommost sequents ('endsequents') are legal premises of ρ. The *height* of a derivation is the number of rules on its longest branch (viewing the derivation as a tree whose nodes are sequents and the root is the endsequent).

A *relation mset* $\mathcal{R}$ is a multiset of relation terms Rxy $(x, y \in \mathbb{SV})$. An *equality mset* $\mathcal{E}$ is a multiset of equality terms $x = y$ $(x, y \in \mathbb{SV})$. Let $\mathcal{E}$ be an equality mset. Then for a relation mset $\mathcal{R}$, let $\mathcal{R}[\mathcal{E}]$ denote the relation mset obtained by replacing every x_j in $\mathcal{R}$ with x_i where i is the least number such that $\mathcal{E} \models x_i = x_j$. Here $\models$ is the usual consequence relation for the theory of equality. Define $X[\mathcal{E}]$ analogously for a labelled formula multiset X.

Definition 2.1 (labelled sequent LS)**.** A labelled sequent has the form $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{E}, X \vdash Y$ where $\mathcal{R}$ is a relation mset, $\mathcal{E}$ is an equality mset and X and Y are multisets of labelled formulae.

The equality-free LS corresponding to $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{E}, X \vdash Y$ is $\mathcal{R}[\mathcal{E}], X[\mathcal{E}] \vdash Y[\mathcal{E}]$.

The labelled sequent calculus **LSEqK** is given in Fig. 1. Some rules in [17]—e.g. reflexivity and transitivity rule for equality—do not appear here. These rules are admissible for sequents containing no equality terms in the succedent. We will be unable to derive $\vdash x = x$ and $x = y \wedge y = z \vdash x = z$ but this is fine because **LSEqK** is intended for deriving modal formulae. We introduce a new rule (ls-sc) to simulate the (sc) rule of **INSK** that we will introduce later. ($\Box$r) has a side condition stating that variable y (the *eigenvariable*)

$$\frac{}{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{E}, x : \bot, \Gamma \vdash \Delta} \text{(init-}\bot\text{)} \qquad \frac{}{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{E}, x : p, \Gamma \vdash \Delta, x : p} \text{(init)}$$

$$\frac{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{E}, x : A, \Gamma \vdash \Delta \qquad \mathcal{R}, \mathcal{E}, x : B, \Gamma \vdash \Delta}{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{E}, x : A \vee B, \Gamma \vdash \Delta} (\vee\text{l}) \qquad \frac{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{E}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta, x : A, x : B}{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{E}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta, x : A \vee B} (\vee\text{r})$$

$$\frac{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{E}, x : A, x : B, \Gamma \vdash \Delta}{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{E}, x : A \wedge B, \Gamma \vdash \Delta} (\wedge\text{l}) \qquad \frac{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{E}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta, x : A \qquad \mathcal{R}, \mathcal{E}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta, x : B}{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{E}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta, x : A \wedge B} (\wedge\text{r})$$

$$\frac{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{E}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta, x : A \qquad \mathcal{R}, \mathcal{E}, x : B, \Gamma \vdash \Delta}{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{E}, x : A \to B, \Gamma \vdash \Delta} (\to\text{l}) \qquad \frac{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{E}, x : A, \Gamma \vdash \Delta, x : B}{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{E}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta, x : A \to B} (\to\text{r})$$

$$\frac{\mathcal{R}, Rxy, \mathcal{E}, x : \Box A, y : A, \Gamma \vdash \Delta}{\mathcal{R}, Rxy, \mathcal{E}, x : \Box A, \Gamma \vdash \Delta} (\Box\text{l}) \qquad \frac{\mathcal{R}, Rxy, \mathcal{E}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta, y : A}{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{E}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta, x : \Box A} (\Box\text{r})$$

$$\frac{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{E}, x = y, x : A, y : A, \Gamma \vdash \Delta}{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{E}, x = y, x : A, \Gamma \vdash \Delta} \text{(rep-l)} \qquad \frac{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{E}, x = y, \Gamma \vdash \Delta, x : A, y : A}{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{E}, x = y, \Gamma \vdash \Delta, x : A} \text{(rep-r)}$$

$$\frac{\mathcal{R}, Rxz, Ryz, \mathcal{E}, x = y, \Gamma \vdash \Delta}{\mathcal{R}, Rxz, \mathcal{E}, x = y, \Gamma \vdash \Delta} \text{(rep-R1)} \qquad \frac{\mathcal{R}, Rzx, Rzy, \mathcal{E}, x = y, \Gamma \vdash \Delta}{\mathcal{R}, Rzx, \mathcal{E}, x = y, \Gamma \vdash \Delta} \text{(rep-R2)}$$

$$\frac{\mathcal{R}, Rxy, Ruv, \mathcal{E}, x = u, y = v, \Gamma \vdash \Delta}{\mathcal{R}, Rxy, \mathcal{E}, x = u, y = v, \Gamma \vdash \Delta} \text{(ls-sc) } x \text{ is not } u\text{; } v \text{ not in conclusion}$$

Figure 1: The labelled sequent calculus **LSEqK**. ($\Box$r) has the side condition: y does not appear in the conclusion.

does not appear in the conclusion. An *atomic term* has the form Rxy or $x = y$ for $x, y \in \mathbb{SV}$.

Definition 2.2 (geometric formula)**.** A *geometric formula* is a formula in the first-order language (binary relations R, $=$) of the following form where the P_i are atomic formulae and $\hat{Q}_j$ is a conjunction $Q_{j1} \wedge \ldots \wedge Q_{jk_j}$ of atomic formulae.

$$\forall \bar{z}(P_1 \wedge \ldots \wedge P_m \to \exists \bar{x}(\hat{Q}_1 \vee \ldots \vee \hat{Q}_n)) \tag{2.1}$$

A modal logic extending the basic normal modal logic K can be defined by addition of axioms to the Hilbert calculus for K. Alternatively, we can consider the logic K as the set of formulae valid on all Kripke frames. Modal logics extending K can be obtained as the set of formulae valid on various subclasses of Kripke frames. For example, the axiomatic extension $K + \Box p \to p$ ($K + \Box p \to \Box\Box p$) corresponds to the set of formulae valid on reflexive (resp. transitive) Kripke frames. The modal logic consisting precisely of those formulae valid on Kripke frames satisfying a set of geometric formulae is said to be defined by those geometric formulae. See [1] for further details.

Theorem 2.3 (Negri)**.** *Let L be a modal logic defined by the geometric formulae $\{\alpha_i\}_{i \in I}$. Then $\boldsymbol{LSEqK} + \{\rho_i\}_{i \in I}$ is a LS calculus for L where ρ_i is a structural rule of the form GRS below corresponding to the geometric formulae (2.1).*

$$\frac{Q_1\{y_1/x_1\}, P, \mathcal{R}, \mathcal{E}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta \qquad \ldots \qquad Q_N\{y_N/x_N\}, P, \mathcal{R}, \mathcal{E}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta}{P, \Gamma \vdash \Delta} \, GRS$$

Here $Q_j = Q_{j1}, \ldots, Q_{jk_j}$ and $P = P_1, \ldots, P_m$. The rule ρ_i has the side condition that the eigenvariables $y_1 \ldots, y_n$ *do not appear in the conclusion.*

Notation. Let **LSEqK*** denote some extension of **LSEqK** by GRS rules.

Example 2.4. By the Sahlqvist correspondence and completeness theorems, the modal logic $K + \Diamond\Box p \to \Box\Diamond p$ is defined by the geometric formula

$$\forall xyz(Rxy \wedge Rxz \to \exists uv(Ryu \wedge Rzv \wedge u = v))$$

The GRS rule corresponding to this geometric formula is given below.

$$\frac{\mathcal{R}, Rxy, Rxz, Ryu, Rzv, \mathcal{E}, u = v, \Gamma \vdash \Delta}{\mathcal{R}, Rxy, Rxz, \mathcal{E}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta}\, u, v \text{ not in conclusion} \tag{2.2}$$

By Theorem 2.3 we have that **LSEqK** extended by the above rule is a calculus for $K + \Diamond\Box p \to \Box\Diamond p$.

The graph $G(\mathcal{R})$ defined by relation mset $\mathcal{R}$ is the directed graph whose nodes are the state variables in $\mathcal{R}$ and $x \to y$ is a directed edge in $G(\mathcal{R})$ iff $Rxy \in \mathcal{R}$.

Definition 2.5 (treelike)**.** A non-empty relation mset $\mathcal{R}$ is *treelike* if the directed graph defined by $\mathcal{R}$ is a tree (i.e. it is rooted, irreflexive and its underlying undirected graph has no cycle).

Example 2.6. Consider the following relation msets: $\{Rxx\}$, $\{Rxy, Ruv\}$, $\{Rxy, Rzy\}$, and $\{Rxy, Rxz, Ryu, Rzu\}$. The graphs defined by these sets are, respectively,



None of the above relation msets are treelike because the graphs defined by their relation msets are not trees. From left-to-right, graph 1 contains a reflexive state; graph 2 and graph 3 are not rooted. Frame 4 is not a tree because the underlying undirected graph contains a cycle.

Definition 2.7 (labelled tree sequent LTS)**.** A *labelled tree-sequent* is a labelled sequent of the form $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{E}, X \vdash Y$ where $\mathcal{E} = \emptyset$ and:

(1) if $\mathcal{R} \neq \emptyset$ then $\mathcal{R}$ is treelike and every state variable x that occurs in $X \cup Y$ occurs in $\mathcal{R}$.
(2) if $\mathcal{R} = \emptyset$ then every label in X and Y is the same.

Some examples of LTS:

$$x : A \vdash x : B \qquad \vdash y : A \qquad Rxy, Rxz, x : A \vdash y : B$$

A state variable may occur in the relation mset and not in the X, Y multisets (e.g. z above far right). Below are *not* LTS (assume no two in x, y, z identical).

$$x : A \vdash x : B, z : C \qquad Rxy, x : A \vdash z : B \qquad Rxy, Ryz, Rxz \vdash$$

From left-to-right above, the first labelled sequent is not an LTS because the relation mset is empty and yet two distinct state variables x and z occur in the sequent, violating condition Def. 2.7(2). The next sequent violates Def. 2.7(1) because z does not appear in the relation mset. The final sequent is not an LTS because the relation mset is not treelike.

Definition 2.8 (labelled tree sequent with equality)**.** A *labelled tree-sequent with equality* (LTSE) is a labelled sequent of the form $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{E}, X \vdash Y$ where:

(1) if $\mathcal{R} \neq \emptyset$ then $\mathcal{R}$ is treelike and every state variable in X, Y and $\mathcal{E}$ occurs in $\mathcal{R}$.
(2) if $\mathcal{R} = \emptyset$ then every label in X, Y and $\mathcal{E}$ is the same.

Clearly every LTS is an LTSE. Each of the following is an LTSE:

$$Rxy, x = y, x : A \vdash y : B \qquad y = y \vdash y : A \qquad Rxy, Rxz, y = z, x : A \vdash z : B$$

The following are *not* LTSE (assume that no two in x, y and z are identical).

$$x = z, x : A \vdash x : B \qquad Rxy, y = z, x : A \vdash y : B \qquad Rxy, Ryz, Rxz, x = y, x = z \vdash$$

From left-to-right above, the first labelled sequent is not an LTSE because the relation mset is empty and yet the sequent contains more than one label. The next sequent violates Def. 2.8(2) because z does not appear in the relation mset. The final sequent is not an LTSE because the relation mset is not treelike.

Definition 2.9 (nested sequent NS)**.** A *nested sequent* is a finite object defined recursively as follows:

$$\text{NS} := X \vdash Y \text{ where } X \text{ and } Y \text{ are formula multisets}$$
$$\text{NS} := \text{NS}, [\text{NS}], \ldots, [\text{NS}]$$

The underlying structure of a nested sequent is a tree decorated with sequents. In Sec. 1 we presented the decorated trees defined by (1.1) and (1.2).

Definition 2.10 (indexed nested sequent INS)**.** An *indexed nested sequent* is a finite object defined recursively as follows:

$$\text{INS} := X \vdash^n Y \text{ where } X \text{ and } Y \text{ are formula multisets and } n \in \mathbb{N}$$
$$\text{INS} := \text{INS}, [\text{INS}], \ldots, [\text{INS}]$$

As we have already noted, an INS distinguishes itself from a NS precisely when multiple traditional sequents in the INS have the same index.

Notation. We write $\Gamma\{X \vdash^n Y, \Delta\}$ to mean the INS Γ containing the occurrence $X \vdash^n Y, \Delta$. Also $\Gamma\{X \vdash^n Y, \Delta\}\{U \vdash^m Y, \Sigma\}$ denotes an INS Γ containing two distinct occurrences: $X \vdash^n Y, \Delta$ and $U \vdash^m Y, \Sigma$. Here Δ and Σ have the form [INS], ..., [INS] (possibly empty).

The indexed nested sequent calculus **INSK** [5] for K is given in Fig. 2. The usual nested sequent calculus [7, 15] for K can be obtained by ignoring the indices and deleting the rules (fc-l), (fc-r) and (sc). Fitting's Geach scheme [5, Sec. 8] yields an INS rule corresponding to $G(h, i, j, k)$ when $i, j > 0$. E.g. here is the rule corresponding to $\Diamond\Box p \to \Box\Diamond p$ (*index c does not appear in conclusion*).

$$\frac{\Gamma\{[X \vdash^a Y, \Delta, [\vdash^c]], [U \vdash^b V, \Sigma, [\vdash^c]]\}}{\Gamma\{[X \vdash^a Y, \Delta], [U \vdash^b V, \Sigma]\}} \tag{2.3}$$

In contrast to [5], in this work we give INS calculi for *all* Geach axioms.

$$\frac{}{\Gamma\{\bot, X \vdash^n Y, \Delta\}}\ (\text{init-}\bot) \qquad \frac{}{\Gamma\{p, X \vdash^n Y, p, \Delta\}}\ (\text{init}) \qquad \frac{\Gamma\{\Box A, X \vdash^n Y, \Delta, [A, U \vdash^m V, \Sigma]\}}{\Gamma\{\Box A, X \vdash^n Y, \Delta, [U \vdash^m V, \Sigma]\}}\ (\Box\text{l})$$

$$\frac{\Gamma\{X \vdash^n Y, A, B, \Delta\}}{\Gamma\{X \vdash^n Y, A \vee B, \Delta\}}\ (\vee\text{r}) \qquad \frac{\Gamma\{X, A, B \vdash^n Y, \Delta\}}{\Gamma\{X, A \wedge B \vdash^n Y, \Delta\}}\ (\wedge\text{l}) \qquad \frac{\Gamma\{X \vdash^n Y, A, \Delta\} \qquad \Gamma\{X \vdash^n Y, B, \Delta\}}{\Gamma\{X \vdash^n Y, A \wedge B, \Delta\}}\ (\wedge\text{r})$$

$$\frac{\Gamma\{A, X \vdash^n Y, \Delta][A, U \vdash^n V, \Sigma\}}{\Gamma\{A, X \vdash^n Y, \Delta][U \vdash^n V, \Sigma\}}\ (\text{fc-l}) \qquad \frac{\Gamma\{A, X \vdash^n Y, B, \Delta\}}{\Gamma\{X \vdash^n Y, A \to B, \Delta\}}\ (\to\text{r}) \qquad \frac{\Gamma\{X \vdash^n Y, \Delta, [\ \vdash^m A]\}}{\Gamma\{X \vdash^n Y, \Delta, \Box A\}}\ (\Box\text{r})$$

$$\frac{\Gamma\{A, X \vdash^n Y, \Delta\} \qquad \Gamma\{B, X \vdash^n Y, \Delta\}}{\Gamma\{A \vee B, X \vdash^n Y, \Delta\}}\ (\vee\text{l}) \qquad \frac{\Gamma\{X \vdash^n Y, A, \Delta\} \qquad \Gamma\{B, X \vdash^n Y, \Delta\}}{\Gamma\{A \to B, X \vdash^n Y, \Delta\}}\ (\to\text{l})$$

$$\frac{\Gamma\{X \vdash^n Y, A, \Delta\}\{U \vdash^n V, A, \Sigma\}}{\Gamma\{X \vdash^n Y, A, \Delta\}\{U \vdash^n V, \Sigma\}}\ (\text{fc-r}) \qquad \frac{\Gamma\,\{X \vdash^n Y, \Delta, [P \vdash^m Q, \Pi]\}\,\{U \vdash^n V, \Sigma, [\ \vdash^m\ ]\}}{\Gamma\,\{X \vdash^n Y, \Delta, [P \vdash^m Q, \Pi]\}\,\{U \vdash^n V, \Sigma\}}\ (\text{sc})$$

Figure 2: The indexed nested sequent calculus **INSK** for modal logic K. The rule ($\Box$r) has the side condition that index m does not appear in the conclusion.

3. Syntactic cut-elimination for LTSE-derivations

An LTSE-derivation is a restricted form of a labelled sequent derivation.

Definition 3.1 (LTSE-derivation in **LSEqK***)**.** An LTSE-derivation in **LSEqK*** is a derivation in that calculus where every sequent is an LTSE.

We now present a syntactic proof of cut-elimination simultaneously for the labelled sequent calculus **LSEqK*** and for LTSE-derivations in **LSEqK***. Of course, the proof for **LSEqK*** appears in [17] so our focus is on LTSE-derivations. We aim to reuse as much as we can from that proof. The main adaptation for LTSE-derivations is a nuanced version of the substitution lemma. Note that certain rule instances—e.g. (rep-R1) and non-trivial instances of (rep-R2)—*cannot* occur in an LTSE-derivation as they do not preserve LTSE. The following is by induction on the size of A.

Lemma 3.2. *The sequent $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{E}, x : A, \Gamma \vdash x : A, \Delta$ for arbitrary formula A is derivable in **LSEqK***. Moreover, if the sequent is LTSE then it has an LTSE-derivation in **LSEqK***.*

Let $\bar{x} = (x_1, \ldots, x_{N+1})$ and $\bar{y} = (y_1, \ldots, y_{N+1})$. Then $\mathcal{R}\{\bar{y}/\bar{x}\}$ is obtained by replacing every occurrence of x_i in relation mset $\mathcal{R}$ with y_i $(1 \leq i \leq N+1)$. For an equality mset $\mathcal{E}$ and a labelled formula multiset X define $\mathcal{E}\{y/x\}$ and $X\{y/x\}$ analogously. When $\bar{x} = (x)$ and $\bar{y} = (y)$ we simply write $\{y/x\}$. In words, $\{y/x\}$ is the substitution of every occurrence of x with y. The following is trivial.

Lemma 3.3. *Let δ be a derivation of $s = \mathcal{R}, \mathcal{E}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta$ in **LSEqK***. For $x, y \in \mathbb{SV}$ s.t. y is not in s, there is a derivation δ' of $\mathcal{R}\{y/x\}, \mathcal{E}\{y/x\}, \Gamma\{y/x\} \vdash \Delta\{y/x\}$ of the same height. Moreover, if δ is an LTSE-derivation then so is δ'.*

The labelled sequent calculus **LSEqK*** has a stronger substitution property: for all $x, y \in \mathbb{SV}$, if $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{E}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta$ is derivable, then there is a derivation of $\mathcal{R}\{y/x\}, \mathcal{E}\{y/x\}, \Gamma\{y/x\} \vdash \Delta\{y/x\}$ of the same height. However this property does *not* preserve LTSE-derivations. We need the following nuanced property.

Lemma 3.4 (substitution)**.** *Let δ be a derivation of $\mathcal{R}, Rxy, Rxz, \mathcal{E}, y = z, \Gamma \vdash \Delta$ in **LSEqK*** where $y = z \notin \mathcal{E}$ and $Rxy \notin \mathcal{R}$.[3] Then there is a derivation δ' of $\mathcal{R}\{z/y\}, Rxz, \mathcal{E}\{z/y\}, X\{z/y\} \vdash Y\{z/y\}$ of the same height. Moreover, if δ is an LTSE-derivation then so is δ'.*

[3]Note: $Rxy \notin \mathcal{R}$ and $y = z \notin \mathcal{E}$ ensure that $\mathcal{R}\{z/y\}, Rxz, \mathcal{E}\{z/y\}, X\{z/y\} \vdash Y\{z/y\}$ is an LTSE whenever s is an LTSE and prevents a residual term $z = z$, respectively.

Proof. Induction on the height of δ. Consider the last rule ρ in δ. For most ρ it suffices to apply the induction hypothesis to its premises and then reapply ρ.

Suppose ρ is ($\Box$R) below left (α not in conclusion; $x \neq \alpha$). For fresh w:

$$\frac{\mathcal{R}, Rx\alpha, \mathcal{E}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta, \alpha : A}{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{E}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta, x : \Box A}\,\rho \qquad \dfrac{\dfrac{\dfrac{\mathcal{R}, Rx\alpha, \mathcal{E}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta, \alpha : A}{\mathcal{R}, Rxw, \mathcal{E}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta, w : A}\,\text{IH}}{(\mathcal{R}, Rxw)\{\alpha/\beta\}, \mathcal{E}\{\alpha/\beta\}, \Gamma\{\alpha/\beta\} \vdash \Delta\{\alpha/\beta\}, w : A}\,\text{IH}}{\mathcal{R}\{\alpha/\beta\}, \mathcal{E}\{\alpha/\beta\}, \Gamma\{\alpha/\beta\} \vdash \Delta\{\alpha/\beta\}, (x : \Box A)\{\alpha/\beta\}}\,\rho$$

The case of a GRS rule is similar. Now suppose that the last rule in δ is (ls-sc). By inspection the Ruv term in the premise of (ls-sc) in Fig. 1 cannot be active in the rule for then the premise would have the form $\mathcal{R}', Rus, Ruv, s = v, \ldots$ ($s \in \mathbb{SV}$). Since u is not x by the side condition, $u = v$ is not $s = v$, and hence the latter must occur in the conclusion contradicting the side condition of (ls-sc).

By inspection, δ' is an LTSE-derivation whenever δ is an LTSE-derivation. □

Lemma 3.5 (weakening)**.** *Let δ be a derivation of $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{E}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta$ in **LSEqK**. Then there is a derivation δ' of $s = \mathcal{R}, \mathcal{R}', \mathcal{E}, \mathcal{E}', \Gamma, \Gamma' \vdash \Delta, \Delta'$ of the same height. Moreovoer, if s is an LTSE and δ is an LTSE-derivation, then so is δ'.*

Proof. Induction on the height of δ. Consider the last rule ρ in δ. Use the substitution of eigenvariables with new variables to avoid a clash with the variables in the weakening terms. The claim that δ' is an LTSE-derivation whenever s is an LTSE and δ is an LTSE-derivation can be verified by inspection. □

The proof of the following lemma follows the proof in [17].

Lemma 3.6 (invertible)**.** *Let δ be a derivation of the conclusion of a rule instance in **LSEqK**. Then there is a derivation δ' of the premise of that rule instance of the same height. Moreover, if δ is an LTSE-derivation then so is δ'.*

There are four rules of contraction.

$$\frac{\mathcal{R}, Rxy, Rxy, \mathcal{E}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta}{\mathcal{R}, Rxy, \mathcal{E}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta} \qquad \frac{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{E}, x = y, x = y, \Gamma \vdash \Delta}{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{E}, x = y, \Gamma \vdash \Delta} \qquad \frac{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{E}, x : A, x : A, \Gamma \vdash \Delta}{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{E}, x : A, \Gamma \vdash \Delta} \qquad \frac{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{E}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta, x : A, x : A}{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{E}, x : A, \Gamma \vdash \Delta, x : A}$$

Lemma 3.7 (contraction)**.** *Let δ be a derivation in **LSEqK*** of the premise of any of the above contraction rules. Then there is a derivation δ' of its conclusion with the same height. Moreover, if δ is an LTSE-derivation then so is δ'.*

Proof. Induction on the height of δ. In the general case (δ not necessarily an LTSE-derivation): applying height-preserving invertibility to $\mathcal{R}, Rxy, \mathcal{E}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta, y : A, x : \Box A$ yields $\mathcal{R}, Rxy, Rxz, \mathcal{E}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta, y : A, z : A$ and then the stronger substitution property yields height-preserving $\mathcal{R}, Rxz, Rxz, \mathcal{E}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta, z : A, z : A$ and the required sequent follows from the IH.

Consider the case when δ is an LTSE-derivation whose last rule is ($\Box$r). Then the required LTSE-derivation is below right (y and z are eigenvariables).

$$\frac{\mathcal{R}, Rxy, \mathcal{E}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta, y : A, x : \Box A}{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{E}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta, x : \Box A, x : \Box A}\,(\Box\text{r}) \qquad \dfrac{\dfrac{\dfrac{\dfrac{\mathcal{R}, Rxy, \mathcal{E}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta, y : A, x : \Box A}{\mathcal{R}, Rxy, Rxz, \mathcal{E}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta, y : A, z : A}\,\text{inv}}{\mathcal{R}, Rxy, Rxz, \mathcal{E}, y = z, \Gamma \vdash \Delta, y : A, z : A}\,\text{weak}}{\mathcal{R}, Rxz, \mathcal{E}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta, z : A, z : A}\,\text{subs.}}{\dfrac{\mathcal{R}, Rxz, \mathcal{E}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta, z : A}{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{E}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta, x : \Box A}\,(\Box\text{r})}\,\text{IH}$$

□

The usual cut-rule is below left. We use the cut-rule below right which has the property that the conclusion is an LTSE whenever the premises are LTSE.

$$\frac{\mathcal{R}_1, \mathcal{E}_1, \Gamma \vdash \Delta, x:A \qquad \mathcal{R}_2, \mathcal{E}_2, x:A, \Sigma \vdash \Pi}{\mathcal{R}_1, \mathcal{R}_2, \mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{E}_2, \Gamma, \Sigma \vdash \Delta, \Pi} \qquad \frac{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{E}_1, \Gamma \vdash \Delta, x:A \qquad \mathcal{R}, \mathcal{E}_2, x:A, \Sigma \vdash \Pi}{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{E}_2, \Gamma, \Sigma \vdash \Delta, \Pi}$$

Theorem 3.8. *The cut-rule is eliminable in* ***LSEqK****. *Moreover, if the original derivation is an LTSE-derivation, then so is the transformed derivation.*

Proof. We will show how to eliminate a derivation ending with the cut-rule whose premises are cutfree. Primary induction on the size of the cutformula and secondary induction on the sum of the heights of the derivations of the premises. We focus on the case of an LTSE-derivation.

First suppose that the cut-formula is *not* principal in the left premise (the argument is analogous if the cut-formula is not principal in the right premise). When the last rule in the left premise is a unary rule we have the following situation (the case of a n-ary rule is similar).

$$\dfrac{\dfrac{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{R}', \mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{E}', \Gamma_1 \vdash \Delta_1, x:B}{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{E}_1, \Gamma_1 \vdash \Delta_1, x:B}\,\rho \qquad \mathcal{R}, \mathcal{E}_2, x:B, \Gamma_2 \vdash \Delta_2}{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{E}_2, \Gamma_1, \Gamma_2 \vdash \Delta_1, \Delta_2}\,\text{cut}$$

Even if ρ has a side condition, since the eigenvariable(s) $\bar{y}$ do not appear in its conclusion, it follows that no variable in $\bar{y}$ appears in $\mathcal{R}$ and hence not in the right premise of cut either, by Def. 2.8(1). So we may proceed:

$$\dfrac{\dfrac{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{R}', \mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{E}', \Gamma_1 \vdash \Delta_1, x:B \qquad \mathcal{R}, \mathcal{E}_2, x:B, \Gamma_2 \vdash \Delta_2}{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{R}', \mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{E}', \mathcal{E}_2, \Gamma_1, \Gamma_2 \vdash \Delta_1, \Delta_2}\,\text{cut}}{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{E}_2, \Gamma_1\Gamma_2 \vdash \Delta_1, \Delta_2}\,\rho$$

The remaining case to consider is when the cut-formula is principal in both left and right premise. Once again the interesting case is when the original derivation is an LTSE-derivation and last rule in the left premise is ($\Box$r).

$$\dfrac{\dfrac{\mathcal{R}, Rxy, Rxz, \mathcal{E}_1, \Gamma_1 \vdash \Delta_1, y:A}{\mathcal{R}, Rxz, \mathcal{E}_1, \Gamma_1 \vdash \Delta_1, x:\Box A}\,(\Box\text{r}) \qquad \dfrac{\mathcal{R}, Rxz, \mathcal{E}_2, x:\Box A, z:A \vdash \Gamma_2 \vdash \Delta_2}{\mathcal{R}, Rxz, \mathcal{E}_2, x:\Box A, \Gamma_2 \vdash \Delta_2}\,(\Box\text{l})}{\mathcal{R}, Rxz, \mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{E}_2, \Gamma_1, \Gamma_2 \vdash \Delta_1, \Delta_2}\,\text{cut}$$

Then proceed:

$$\dfrac{\dfrac{\dfrac{\mathcal{R}, Rxy, Rxz, \mathcal{E}_1, \Gamma_1 \vdash \Delta_1, y:A}{\mathcal{R}, Rxy, Rxz, y=z, \mathcal{E}_1, \Gamma_1 \vdash \Delta_1, y:A}\,\text{weak}}{\mathcal{R}, Rxz, \mathcal{E}_1, \Gamma_1 \vdash \Delta_1, y:A}\,\text{subs.} \qquad \text{cut}\left\{\begin{array}{c}\mathcal{R}, Rxz, \mathcal{E}_1, \Gamma_1 \vdash \Delta_1, x:\Box A \\ \mathcal{R}, Rxz, \mathcal{E}_2, x:\Box A, z:A \vdash \Gamma_2 \vdash \Delta_2\end{array}\right.}{\mathcal{R}, Rxz, \mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{E}_2, z:A \vdash \Gamma_1, \Gamma_2 \vdash \Delta_1, \Delta_2}\,\text{cut}}{\mathcal{R}, Rxz, \mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{E}_2, \Gamma_1, \Gamma_1, \Gamma_2 \vdash \Delta_1, \Delta_1, \Delta_2}\,\text{ctr}$$

□

4. Geach logics: sound and complete for LTSE-derivations

We already know that there are labelled sequent calculi for Geach logics since the corresponding frame conditions are geometric. However it remains to show that these labelled sequent calculi are complete for the Geach logic when we restrict to LTSE derivations. That is the content of this section. First define:

$$\mathsf{R}^0xy := \emptyset \qquad \mathsf{R}^{n+1}xy := \{Rxy_1, Ry_1y_2, \ldots, Ry_{n-1}y_n, Ry_ny\}$$
$$\hat{\mathsf{R}}^0xy := \top \qquad \hat{\mathsf{R}}^{n+1}xy := Rxy_1 \wedge Ry_1y_2 \wedge \ldots \wedge Ry_{n-1}y_n \wedge Ry_ny$$

E.g. $\mathsf{R}^2xy = \{Rxy_1, Ry_1y\}$ and $\hat{\mathsf{R}}^2 = Rxy_1 \wedge Ry_1y$.

Let $\bar{y} = y_1, \ldots, y_{h-1}, y$; $\bar{z} = z_1, \ldots, z_{j-1}, z$; $\bar{u} = u_1, \ldots, u_{i-1}, u$ and $\bar{v} = v_1, \ldots, v_{k-1}, v$ and let λ be the function that returns the last element of a non-empty sequence. It is well-known that the first-order frame condition $f(h,i,j,k)$ below corresponds to the Geach formula $G(h,i,j,k)$ given in (1.3).

$$\forall x\bar{y}\bar{z}\left(\hat{\mathsf{R}}^hxy \wedge \hat{\mathsf{R}}^jxz \longrightarrow \exists\bar{u}\bar{v}\left(\hat{\mathsf{R}}^i\lambda(x\bar{y})u \wedge \hat{\mathsf{R}}^k\lambda(x\bar{z})v \wedge \lambda(x\bar{y}\bar{u}) = \lambda(x\bar{z}\bar{v})\right)\right) \tag{4.1}$$

Some examples of Geach formulae and their corresponding frame conditions:

(ref) $\Box p \to p$ $\qquad$ $\forall x(\top \to \exists u(Rxu \wedge u = x))$ so $i = 1$ and others are 0

(trans) $\Box p \to \Box\Box p$ $\qquad$ $\forall xz_1z(Rxz_1 \wedge Rz_1z \to \exists u(Rxu \wedge u = x))$ so $i = 1$, $j = 2$

From the Sahlqvist correspondence and completeness theorems (see [1]) we have that the modal logic defined by the set $\{f(h_s,i_s,j_s,k_s)\}_{s\in S}$ is precisely the modal logic $K + \{G(h_s,i_s,j_s,k_s)\}_{s\in S}$. Here is the corresponding structural rule where $u_1, \ldots, u_i, u, v_1, \ldots, v_k, v$ do not appear in the conclusion.

$$\frac{\mathcal{R}, \mathsf{R}^hxy, \mathsf{R}^jxz, \mathsf{R}^i\lambda(x\bar{y})u, \mathsf{R}^k\lambda(x\bar{z})v, \lambda(x\bar{y}\bar{u}) = \lambda(x\bar{z}\bar{v}), \mathcal{E}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta}{\mathcal{R}, \mathsf{R}^hxy, \mathsf{R}^jxz, \mathcal{E}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta}\,\rho(h,i,j,k) \tag{4.2}$$

Here is the LTSE derivation of $G(h,i,j,k)$ using $\rho(h,i,j,k)$:

$$\dfrac{\dfrac{\dfrac{\dfrac{\dfrac{\dfrac{\dfrac{\dfrac{\mathsf{R}^hxy, \mathsf{R}^jxz, \mathsf{R}^iyu, \mathsf{R}^kzu, u = u', y : \Box^ip, \ldots, u' : p, u : p \vdash z : \Diamond^kp, \ldots, u' : p}{\mathsf{R}^hxy, \mathsf{R}^jxz, \mathsf{R}^iyu, \mathsf{R}^kzu, u = u', y : \Box^ip, \ldots, u : p \vdash z : \Diamond^kp, \ldots, u' : p}\,\text{Repl}}{\mathsf{R}^hxy, \mathsf{R}^jxz, \mathsf{R}^iyu, \mathsf{R}^kzu, u = u', y : \Box^ip, \ldots, u : p \vdash z : \Diamond^kp}\,\Diamond\text{r}}{\mathsf{R}^hxy, \mathsf{R}^jxz, \mathsf{R}^iyu, \mathsf{R}^kzu', u = u', y : \Box^ip \vdash z : \Diamond^kp}\,\Box\text{l}^*}{\mathsf{R}^hxy, \mathsf{R}^jxz, y : \Box^ip \vdash z : \Diamond^kp}\,\rho(h,i,j,k)}{\mathsf{R}^hxy, y : \Box^ip \vdash x : \Box^j\Diamond^kp}\,\Box\text{r}}{x : \Diamond^h\Box^ip \vdash x : \Box^j\Diamond^kp}\,\Diamond\text{l}^*}{\vdash x : \Diamond^h\Box^ip \to \Box^j\Diamond^kp}$$

Theorem 4.1. *$A \in K + \{G(h_s,i_s,j_s,k_s)\}_{s\in S}$ iff there is an LTSE-derivation of $\vdash x : A$ in $\boldsymbol{LSEqK} + \{f(h_s,i_s,j_s,k_s)\}_{s\in S}$.*

Proof. The direction ($\Rightarrow$) is completeness. We need to show that every axiom and rule of the logic is LTSE-derivable. We saw that $G(h_s,i_s,j_s,k_s)$ is LTSE-derivable. Here is the normal axiom:

$$\dfrac{\dfrac{\dfrac{\dfrac{\dfrac{Rxy, x:\Box A, y:A \vdash y:B, y:A \qquad Rxy, y:B, x:\Box A, y:A \vdash y:B}{Rxy, x:\Box A, y:A, x:\Box(A\to B), y:A\to B \vdash y:B}\,(\to\mathrm{l})}{Rxy, x:\Box A, x:\Box(A\to B)\vdash y:B}\,(\Box\mathrm{l}),\,(\Box\mathrm{l})}{x:\Box A, x:\Box(A\to B)\vdash x:\Box B}\,(\Box\mathrm{r})}{x:\Box(A\to B)\vdash x:(\Box A\to\Box B)}\,(\to\mathrm{r})}{\vdash x:\Box(A\to B)\to(\Box A\to\Box B)}\,(\to\mathrm{r})$$

Simulating *modus ponens* and necessitation is as usual. Recall that the former requires the cut-rule. From the cut-elimination theorem it follows that we can restrict our attention to LTSE-derivations.

To show soundness ($\Leftarrow$) it suffices to show that every rule instance (restricted to LTSE-derivations) of the calculus is sound for $K+\{G(h_s,i_s,j_s,k_s)\}_{s\in S}$. In fact, there is a shortcut for proving soundness: since we already know [17] that Negri's labelled sequent calculus with equality is sound for this logic (interpreting the sequents under the Kripke semantics), derive each of the **LSEqK** rules in that calculus. Indeed the only new rule is (ls-sc). Given the premises of (ls-sc), apply the full substitution lemma with $\{x/u\}$ and $\{y/v\}$ together with appropriate contraction and weakening to get the conclusion. □

5. Maps between **LSEqK*** and **INSK*** calculi for Geach logics

It has known [13] that a nested sequent is isomorphic to a labelled tree sequent up to labelling of state variables. This means that the rules in one formalism immediately induce rules in the other formalism under this mapping. Now let us extend this map to an isomorphism between INS and LTSE.

INS to LTSE: (i) Rewrite an INS s as the tree τ_s (each node will thus be decorated with a sequent $X\vdash^n Y$ from s). Choose distinct variables from $\mathbb{SV}$ for each node in τ_s and then describe the structure of the tree τ_s as a relation mset $\mathcal{R}$.

Example 5.1. Suppose that s is $X\vdash^0 Y, [P\vdash^1 Q, [U\vdash^0 V], [L\vdash^1 M]], [S\vdash^2 T]$. Then τ_s (see below) is its underlying tree structure.



(5.1)

Labelling each node of τ_s with a distinct variable from $\mathbb{SV}$ as indicated in the diagram, we can describe the tree using the relation mset $\{Rx_1x_2, Rx_1x_3, Rx_3x_4, Rx_3x_5\}$.

(ii) For $y_1,\dots,y_N\in\mathbb{SV}$ occurring in τ_s with corresponding sequents $U_1\vdash^i V_1,\dots,U_N\vdash^i V_N$ i.e each of these has the same index i, define

$$\mathcal{E}_i=\{u=v\,|\,u,v\in\{y_1,\dots,y_N\}\text{ are distinct nodes}\}$$

Set $\mathcal{E}$ as the union over all indices in s.

Example 5.2 (ctd. from Example 5.1)**.** Then $\mathcal{E}_0 = \{x_1 = x_5\}$ and $\mathcal{E}_1 = \{x_3 = x_4\}$ and $\mathcal{E}_2 = \emptyset$. Therefore we have $\mathcal{E} = \{x_1 = x_5, x_3 = x_4\}$.

(iii) The LTSE corresponding to INS is $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{E}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta$ where $\Gamma = \cup_i x_i : U_i$ and $\Delta = \cup_i x_i : V_i$. Here the union is over all $\mathbb{SV}$ variables in τ_s and $U_i \vdash V_i$ is the traditional sequent decorating τ_s at x_i.

Example 5.3 (ctd. from Example 5.2)**.** Then $\Gamma = \{x_1 : X, x_2 : S, x_3 : P, x_4 : L, x_5 : U\}$ and $\Delta = \{x_1 : Y, x_2 : T, x_3 : Q, x_4 : M, x_5 : V\}$. Thus we obtain the LTSE

$$Rx_1x_2, Rx_1x_3, Rx_3x_4, Rx_3x_5, x_1 = x_5, x_3 = x_4, \Gamma \vdash \Delta \tag{5.2}$$

LTSE to INS: Given the LTSE $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{E}, X \vdash Y$, construct the tree τ_s defined by $\mathcal{R}$ (so each node in τ_s corresponds to a distinct variable in $\mathbb{SV}$). Decorate node u in τ_s with the traditional sequent $X_u \vdash Y_u$. Here X_u (Y_u) denotes the subset of X (resp. Y) of formulae with label u. It remains to assign an index to each traditional sequent decorating τ_s. Assign the index so that two traditional sequents have the same index iff their corresponding nodes $u, v \in \mathbb{S}$ in τ_s have the property that $\mathcal{E} \models u = v$.

Example 5.4. Let us illustrate with the LTSE given in (5.2). Then we get the diagram in (5.1) with the indices removed. Since $x_1 = x_5$ we conclude that the nodes x_1 and x_5 must have the same index. Similarly from $x_3 = x_4$ we have that x_3 and x_4 must have the same index. In this way we obtain a diagram equivalent to (5.1).

*Maps between derivations in **LSEqK** and **INSK**.* By inspection, for a rule (ρ) ($\rho \in \{\text{init}, \text{init}-\bot, \vee l, \vee r, \wedge l, \wedge r, -$
in **INSK*** (**LSEqK***) the corresponding rule in **LSEqK*** (resp. **INSK***) is obtained by using the above map on the premise(s) and the conclusion. Furthermore, by inspection, (fc-l) corresponds to (rep-l) and (fc-r) corresponds to (rep-r) under the above maps. Rule (rep-R1) and non-trivial instances of (rep-R2)—the trivial case contracts a relation term and hence does not change the INS—cannot occur in LTSE-derivations. Finally, the (sc) rule is simulated by (ls-sc).

Extension to structural rules for Geach formulae. We have already seen in (4.2) the LTSE-rule $\rho(h, i, j, k)$ corresponding to the Geach formula $G(h, i, j, k)$. The easiest route to define the INS rule corresponding to $G(h, i, j, k)$ is to use $\rho(h, i, j, k)$.

Conclusion of INS rule: Each $Rxy_1, \ldots, Ry_{n-1}y_n$ in the conclusion of the rule is represented by the insertion of the following inside $\Gamma[\,]$.

$$X_1 \vdash^{a_1} Y_1, [X_2 \vdash^{a_2} Y_2, [\ldots [X_{n-1} \vdash^{a_{n-1}} Y_{n-1}, [X_n \vdash^{a_n} Y_n]] \ldots]]$$

Example 5.5. Consider $G(2, 2, 1, 0)$. Then the LTSE-rule $\rho(2, 2, 1, 0)$ is

$$\frac{\mathcal{R}, Rxy_1, Ry_1y, Rxz, Ryu_1, Ru_1u, u = z, \mathcal{E}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta}{\mathcal{R}, Rxy_1, Ry_1y, Rxz, \mathcal{E}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta}\ \rho(2, 2, 2, 0);\ u_1, u \text{ not in conclusion}$$

From the conclusion we generate

$$\Gamma\left[\overbrace{[X_1 \vdash^{a_1} Y_1, [X_2 \vdash^{a_2} Y_2]]}^{\text{due to } Rxy_1, Ry_1y}, \overbrace{[L_1 \vdash^{b_1} M_1]}^{\text{due to } Rxz}\right]$$

$$\text{(init-}\bot\text{)}\ \ \frac{\mathcal{R}, Rxu, u = x, \mathcal{E}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta}{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{E}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta}\ \text{(ref)} \qquad \frac{\mathcal{R}, Rxy, Ryz, Rxu, u = z, \mathcal{E}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta}{\mathcal{R}, Rxy, Ryz, \mathcal{E}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta}\ \text{(trans)}$$

$$\mathcal{R}, Rxy, \mathcal{E}, x : p, \Gamma \vdash \Delta, y : p \quad (\vee\text{l}) \quad (\vee\text{r}) \quad (\wedge\text{l}) \quad (\wedge\text{r})$$

$$\frac{\mathcal{R}, Rxy, \mathcal{E}, x : A \to B, \Gamma \vdash y : A, \Delta \qquad \mathcal{R}, Rxy, \mathcal{E}, x : A \to B, y : B, \Gamma \vdash \Delta}{\mathcal{R}, Rxy, \mathcal{E}, x : A \to B, y : B, \Gamma \vdash \Delta}\ (\to\text{l})$$

$$\frac{\mathcal{R}, Rxy, \mathcal{E}, y : A, \Gamma \vdash \Delta, y : B}{\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{E}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta, x : A \to B}\ (\to\text{r}) \quad \text{(rep-l)} \quad \text{(rep-r)} \quad \text{(rep-R1)} \quad \text{(rep-R2)} \quad \text{(ls-sc)}$$

Figure 3: The labelled sequent calculus **LSEqIp**. In (→r), y does not appear in the conclusion. In (ref) and (trans), u does not appear in the conclusion.

Premise of INS-rule: The eigenvariable chain $Ru_1u_2, \ldots, Ru_{n-1}u_n$ in the premise is represented by the following. Here $c_1, \ldots, c_{n-1}$ are fresh and c is the index which corresponds to $\lambda(x\bar{y}\bar{u})$ (and hence $\lambda(x\bar{z}\bar{v})$) in (4.2) i.e. in terms of the frame condition, c is the index corresponding to the node which 'links' the two branches.

$$\vdash^{c_1}, [\vdash^{c_2}, [\ldots [\vdash^{c_{n-1}}, [\vdash^{c}]] \ldots]]$$

The premise of the INS rule is obtained by inserting this at the appropriate place into the INS obtained for the conclusion.

Example 5.6 (ctd. from Example 5.5)**.** Now Ryu_1, Ru_1u corresponds to $[\vdash^{c_1}, [\vdash^{c}]]$. Since $u = z$ and the index corresponding to z is b_1, we set $c := b_1$. Then we get

$$\Gamma \Big[[X_1 \vdash^{a_1} Y_1, [X_2 \vdash^{a_2} Y_2, [\vdash^{c_1}, [\vdash^{b_1}]]]], [L_1 \vdash^{b_1} M_1]\Big]$$

Thus the INS rule is

$$\frac{\Gamma \big[[X_1 \vdash^{a_1} Y_1, [X_2 \vdash^{a_2} Y_2]], [L_1 \vdash^{b_1} M_1]\big]}{\Gamma \big[[X_1 \vdash^{a_1} Y_1, [X_2 \vdash^{a_2} Y_2, [\vdash^{c_1}, [\vdash^{b_1}]]]], [L_1 \vdash^{b_1} M_1]\big]}$$

By construction we thus obtain maps between derivations in **LSEqK*** and **INSK***. From Thm. 4.1 and the above translation we get:

Corollary 5.7. *$K + \{G(h_s, i_s, j_s, k_s)\}_{s \in S}$ has an indexed nested sequent calculus.*

Note. that [5] does not give rules for $\{\Diamond^h p \to \Box^j p | h, j \geq 0\}$. We are able to handle these logics. E.g. here are the INS and LTSE rules for $\Diamond p \to \Box p$.

$$\frac{\Gamma \big[[X \vdash^{a} Y, \Delta], [U \vdash^{a} V, \Sigma]\big]}{\Gamma \big[[X \vdash^{a} Y, \Delta], [U \vdash^{b} V, \Sigma]\big]} \qquad \frac{\mathcal{R}, Rxy, Rxz, \mathcal{E}, y = z, \Gamma \vdash \Delta}{\mathcal{R}, Rxy, Rxz, \mathcal{E}, \Gamma \vdash \Delta}$$

6. Intermediate logics

Nested sequent calculi have been presented for intuitionistic logic Ip [8] and also for extensions of intuitionistic logic with modalities [22, 15]. Logics between classical and intuitionistic logic are called *intermediate logics*. We are not aware of any nested sequent calculi for intermediate logics. A labelled sequent calculus **LSEqIp** (Fig. 3) has been presented [3] for propositional intuitionistic logic and extended via structural rules to capture those intermediate logics whose Kripke semantics are defined by geometric formulae. In this section we show how to use **LSEqIp** to obtain an INS calculi for suitable intermediate logics.

$$\Gamma\{p, X \vdash^n Y, [U \vdash^m V, p, \Delta]\} \text{ (init-}\bot\text{)} \qquad \frac{\Gamma\{X \vdash^n Y, [\vdash^n], \Delta\}}{\Gamma\{X \vdash^n Y, \Delta\}} \text{ (ref)}$$

$$\frac{\Gamma\{X \vdash^n Y, \Delta, [U \vdash^m V, \Sigma, [P \vdash^s Q, \Pi]], [\vdash^s]\}}{\Gamma\{X \vdash^n Y, \Delta, [U \vdash^m V, \Sigma, [P \vdash^s Q, \Pi]], \}} \text{ (trans)} \qquad \frac{\Gamma\{X \vdash^n Y, [A \vdash^m B], \Delta\}}{\Gamma\{X \vdash^n Y, A \to B, \Delta\}} (\to\text{r})$$

$$\frac{\Gamma\{A \to B, X \vdash^n Y, \Delta, [U \vdash^m V, A, \Sigma]\} \qquad \Gamma\{A \to B, X \vdash^n Y, \Delta, [B, U \vdash^m V, \Sigma]\}}{\Gamma\{A \to B, X \vdash^n Y, \Delta, [U \vdash^m V, \Sigma]\}} (\to\text{l})$$

(∨l) (∨r) (∧l) (∧r) (fc-l) (fc-r) (sc)

Figure 4: The INS calculus **INSIp**.

The INS calculus **INSIp** (Fig. 4) is obtained from the rules of **LSEqIp** by translating each LTSE into an INS. By similar argument to Sec. 3 we can show that the cut-rule is eliminable from **LSEqIp** while preserving LTSE-derivations. Analogous to Sec. 4, an INS calculus can be obtained for intermediate logics that are defined by geometric formulae $f(h, i, j, k)$ (4.1) via the addition of the INS rule corresponding to $\rho(h, i, j, k)$. We showed how to compute the INS rule in the previous section.

For example, the geometric frame condition and corresponding GRS for the logic Ip+$(p \to \bot) \vee ((p \to \bot) \to \bot)$ is given in (2.2). Here is the LTSE-derivation of the axiom. We leave it to the reader to construct the corresponding INS derivation in the calculus extending **INSIp** with rule (2.3).

$$\dfrac{\dfrac{\dfrac{\dfrac{\dfrac{Rxy, Rxz, Ryu, Rzv, \mathbf{y} = \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{y} : \mathbf{p}, \mathbf{v} : \mathbf{p}, z : p \to \bot \vdash y : \bot, z : \bot, \mathbf{v} : \mathbf{p}}{(\to\text{l})\begin{cases} Rxy, Rxz, Ryu, Rzv, \mathbf{y} = \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{y} : \mathbf{p}, z : p \to \bot \vdash y : \bot, z : \bot, \mathbf{v} : \mathbf{p} \\ Rxy, Rxz, Ryu, Rzv, y = v, y : p, z : p \to \bot, \mathbf{v} : \bot \vdash y : \bot, z : \bot \end{cases}} \text{(rep-l)}}{Rxy, Rxz, Ryu, \mathbf{Rzv}, y = v, y : p, \mathbf{z} : \mathbf{p} \to \bot \vdash y : \bot, z : \bot}}{Rxy, Rxz, y : p, z : p \to \bot \vdash y : \bot, z : \bot}\, \rho(1,1,1,1)}{\vdash x : (p \to \bot) \vee ((p \to \bot) \to \bot)}$$

Finally, if we ignore the indices in **INSIp** and delete the rules (fc-l),(fc-r) and (sc) then we obtain a nested sequent calculus for intuitionistic logic. It is instructive to compare this nested sequent calculus with [8].

7. Argumentation on restrictions of the labelled calculus

Constructing a cutfree calculus for a logic of interest may be non-trivial, but it is nevertheless the first step. The next step is to use the calculus to study the logic. Viganò [24] and Negri [17] demonstrate how labelled calculi for modal logics including $K, T, K4, S4$ and Gödel-Löb logic of provability GL can then be used to prove results like decidability and complexity. Indeed there are many avenues to be investigated given the wealth of logics that can be defined in the labelled sequent formalism. This is especially the case in the restricted subclass of LTSE-derivations discussed in this paper since the restriction of the underlying graph permits stronger arguments. In this section we shall see some possibilities. In particular, we introduce a notion of duplicate subgraph and use it to prove a normal form for derivations.

Suppose we want to prove the decidability of $K{+}\Diamond\Diamond\Diamond p \to \Diamond p$ (or equivalently, $K{+}\Box p \to \Box\Box\Box p$). This is a generalised transitivity logic whose semantics are given by Kripke frames

satisfying $\forall xyzw(Rxy \wedge Ryz \wedge Rzw \rightarrow Rxw)$. We shall call this frame condition *3-1-transitivity* to contrast with the usual 2-1-transitivity $\forall xyz(Rxy \wedge Ryz \rightarrow Rxz)$. The decidability of the set $\{K + \Diamond^n p \rightarrow \Diamond p\}_{n\geq 2}$ of logics has been proved via model-theoretic methods [9], and recently via proof-theory [23]. In the latter, the base calculus is essentially the two-type one-sided nested sequent calculus **NS1K**. By two-type we mean that two types of nesting are employed. The one-sided calculus relies on the fact that many of the connectives are inter-definable in classical logic/K to present a calculus having fewer connectives. In that paper, a cutfree calculus for $K + \Diamond\Diamond\Diamond p \rightarrow \Diamond p$ is obtained by the addition of the following 'propagation rule schema' (we omit the details of the calculus).

$$\frac{\Gamma[\Diamond A]^i[A]^j}{\Gamma[\Diamond A]^i[\emptyset]^j}\ \text{pr; } i \overset{3+2k}{\rightsquigarrow} j$$

Here $i \overset{3+2k}{\rightsquigarrow} j$ denotes that j is nested inside i at a depth of $3+2k$ for some $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Decidability of $K + \Diamond\Diamond\Diamond p \rightarrow \Diamond p$ is obtained, in summary, as follows (the result is proved generally and applies to a large class of modal logics, see [23] for full details): backward proof search—i.e. applying the rules of the calculus by matching the conclusion and generating the premise—on an input formula is terminated when an initial sequent is encountered or when two nodes on a branch of (the underlying tree of) the nested sequent have the same label. Thus termination is guaranteed. If backward proof search does not yield a derivation, then take the final labelled tree (corresponding to a non-initial nested sequent), paste together the two nodes on the branch that are identical, and take the closure of the resulting graph under 3-1-transitivity. Finally, a countermodel is constructed by constructing a valuation where a propositional variable holds at a node precisely when it does not hold in the corresponding node in the final labelled tree.

Unfortunately, however, it is not clear how to generalise the propagation rules to give a cutfree calculus for a logic like $K + \Diamond\Diamond\Diamond p \rightarrow \Diamond\Diamond p$. This logic is of special interest because its decidability problem is open. Indeed the decidability problem is open for the set $\{K + \Diamond^k p \rightarrow \Diamond^l p\}_{2\leq l<k}$ of logics.

Given that the labelled sequent calculus/INS calculi are capable of presenting $K + \Diamond\Diamond\Diamond p \rightarrow \Diamond p$ and $K + \Diamond\Diamond\Diamond p \rightarrow \Diamond\Diamond p$ in a modular fashion, it would be interesting to witness the decidability of the former logic in these calculi, and then see if the argument could be generalised to the latter. Although we used a two-sided labelled sequent calculus in previous sections to maintain uniformity with other works on labelled calculi, for conciseness let us now use the one-sided calculus **LS1K** for K (Fig. 5). Negation is pushed onto the the propositional variables; the negation of p is denoted by $\bar{p}$. By induction on height we can prove the admissibility of height-preserving weakening and contraction. A sequent is a tuple $\mathcal{R}, \Gamma$ where $\mathcal{R}$ is a relation set and Γ is a labelled formula multiset. It is helpful to view $\mathcal{R}, \Gamma$ as a directed graph such that every node in the graph is labelled with a formula multiset. From Thm. 2.3, the labelled calculus for $K + \Diamond\Diamond\Diamond p \rightarrow \Diamond p$ is obtained by the addition of the following rule.

$$\frac{Rxu, Rxy, Ryz, Rzu, \mathcal{R}, X}{Rxu, Rxy, Ryz, \mathcal{R}, X}\ (\mathrm{t}_1^3)$$

Now let us set about restricting the form of the relation set. Observe that if the conclusion of a rule is a *labelled rooted directed acyclic graph* (lrDAG), then the premise(s) also have this property ('acyclic' means that the graph has no directed cycles). It is clear that the backward proof search may not terminate in general. What we need is to obtain bounds for the height and the breadth of the lrDAGs in backward proof search that guarantee finding

$$\frac{}{\mathcal{R}, x : p, x : \bar{p}} \qquad \frac{\mathcal{R}, Rxy, \Gamma, y : A}{\mathcal{R}, x : \Box A}\,(\Box) \qquad \frac{\mathcal{R}, Rxy, \Gamma, x : \Diamond A, y : A}{\mathcal{R}, Rxy, \Gamma, x : \Diamond A}\,(\Diamond)$$

$$\frac{\mathcal{R}, \Gamma, x : A \qquad \mathcal{R}, \Gamma, x : B}{\mathcal{R}, \Gamma, x : A \wedge B}\,(\wedge) \qquad \frac{\mathcal{R}, \Gamma, x : A, x : B}{\mathcal{R}, \Gamma, x : A \vee B}\,(\vee)$$

Figure 5: The one-sided labelled sequent calculus **LS1K**. ($\Box$) has the side condition: y does not appear in the conclusion.

a derivation (if one exists). In the remainder of this section we describe how the breadth might be controlled by a notion of duplication which generalises contraction. Note that contraction admissibility on the relation terms is not the issue here. Indeed we are already using a relation *set*. Instead, the issue is with identifying different upward closures that *look* the same, taking into account the edges to/from nodes in the upward closure from/to other nodes in the graph. The notions of n-reduced and 1-reduction are inspired by [10].

An *automorphism* on a labelled graph $g = (V, E)$ is a permutation π of V such that $\forall x, y \in V$: $(x, y) \in E$ iff $(\pi(x), \pi(y)) \in E$ and for every $x \in V$ the label of x and $\pi(x)$ is identical. We have extended the definition on non-labelled graphs so that the automorphism preserves labels. Let $x{\uparrow}$ denote the upward closure of the node x in g.

Definition 7.1 (n-multiplicity)**.** Let g be a lrDAG. A node x in g has *n-multiplicity* ($n \geq 1$) if either

(1) the label at x is a multiset of the form $\overbrace{\{B, \ldots, B\}}^{n \text{ times}} \cup X$ for some formula B and multiset X, or
(2) x has distinct children $x_1, \ldots, x_n$ such that g has a non-trivial automorphism fixing nodes outside $x_1{\uparrow}$ and $x_j{\uparrow}$ for every j ($1 \leq j \leq n$).

Definition 7.2 (n-reduced)**.** An lrDAG g is *n-reduced* ($n \geq 1$) if every node has at most multiplicity n. A derivation is *n-reduced* if every lrDAG therein is n-reduced.

The 1-*reduction* of a lrDAG g is the 1-reduced lrDAG g^1 obtained by repeatedly choosing a topmost node (i.e. a node closest to the leaves) that has multiplicity greater than 1 and identifying (pasting) the upward closure of the other nodes witnessing this multiplicity onto the upward closure of this node, until a 1-reduced lrDAG is obtained.

Lemma 7.3. *If the lrDAG g is derivable then its 1-reduction g^1 is derivable.*

Proof. Choose a topmost node with multiplicity greater than 1. By the height-preserving substitution lemma (see below Lem. 3.3) and height-preserving contraction, the lrDAG obtained at each step of the 1-reduction algorithm is derivable. □

We then have a normal form for derivations.

Lemma 7.4. *Suppose that the lrDAG g is derivable in $\boldsymbol{LS1K} + (t_1^3)$. Then there is a 2-reduced derivation of g.*

Proof. Induction on the height of the derivation of $x : A$. Consider the last rule r in the derivation. Obtain the height-preserving 1-reduction of the premise(s) and apply the induction hypothesis to obtain a 2-reduced derivation of the premise(s). Now reapply r. □

Consider an lrDAG with height bounded by some natural number. Is it the case that there are only finitely many 2-reduced lrDAGs? It turns out that this is not the case even for height restricted to 2. For example, the following lrDAG can be extended arbitrarily (suppose that the label is p at every node for argument's sake) such that it has height 2 and is 1-reduced.



However finiteness follows if we make further assumptions on the lrDAGs. For example, consider the following *separation property*:

> (S): if x and y are incomparable nodes in a lrDAG g, then the subgraphs $x{\uparrow}$ and $y{\uparrow}$ in g do not share any nodes in common.

By inspection, if the conclusion of a rule in $\mathbf{LS1K} + (\mathrm{t}_1^3)$ satisfies (S), then the premise(s) also has this property. Define the *height* of an lrDAG g to be length of the maximum path from root to leaf.

Lemma 7.5. *Let g be a 2-reduced lrDAG satisfying (S) of height N where the labels are multisets of formulae from the finite set Ω. Then the number of nodes in g is finite and computable from N and $|\Omega|$.*

Proof. Induction on N. If $N = 1$ then g can be decomposed into a root x and children $x_1, \ldots, x_n$ with no edges between the children. The number of possibilities for these children is $|\mathcal{P}(\Omega)|^2$ where $\mathcal{P}$ is the powerset operator. Here we have the exponent 2 because duplicates of a formula (but not triplicates) are permitted in the label.

Now suppose that $N = k + 1$. We can decompose g into (i) a root x, (ii) children $x_1, \ldots, x_n$ and (iii) possibly some edges from x to nodes in $x_1{\uparrow}, \ldots, x_n{\uparrow}$. In particular, (S) prohibits edges between between any nodes in $x_i{\uparrow}$ and $x_j{\uparrow}$ for $i \neq j$. The number of possible labels for x is $|\mathcal{P}(\Omega)|^2$. Now suppose that x has a single child x_1. By the induction hypothesis, the number α of nodes in $x_1{\uparrow}$ is computable from N and $|\Omega|$. So there are at most α edges from x to a node in $x_1{\uparrow}$. It follows that the number of lrDAGs of height at most N such that the root x has a single child is bounded by some number β computable from N and Ω. Now it suffices to observe that x cannot have more that $(2^\beta)^2$ children, for if it did, one of the children would have multiplicity greater than 2, violating the 2-reduced assumption. □

Unfortunately this is not enough yet to prove decidability because we do not have a bound on the height of a lrDAG in backward proof search. If we had a bound, then decidability follows from Lem. 7.5. In the case of $K + \Diamond\Diamond p \to \Diamond p$, decidability in the labelled sequent calculus is argued [24] using the observation that at some distance away from the root, all the formulae that can 'travel' away from the root have already been uncovered, and hence every new node that is introduced is 'essentially' the same. This can

be exploited to restrict proof search to 'minimal derivations' where no redundant nodes are added (equivalently: bounding the number of ($\Box$) rules that can be applied). In the case of a generalised form of transitivity such as $K + \Diamond\Diamond\Diamond p \to \Diamond p$, it is not the case that every new node is essentially the same; the idea might be to identify some periodicity under which chains of nodes are essentially the same.

8. Conclusion

This work can be seen as part of a larger program to classify various proof-systems as subsystems of the labelled sequent calculus. Understanding the relationships between the various formalisms is not only of theoretical importance, but will also help to simplify the proofs, and avoid the need for independent proofs in each formalism. It is not our intention to suggest that only one of { NS, LTS } and only one of { INS, LTSE } is worthy of consideration. Aside from notational preference, there are distinct advantages to each approach:

Recall that (I)NS were obtained by generalising the traditional sequent. Meanwhile LTS(E) can be seen as specific cases of the labelled sequents. Extending a formalism by generalisation has the advantage of intuition: extend just enough to capture the logic of interest without losing nice syntactic properties. Obtaining a formalism by specialisation opens the possibility of coercing existing results to the new situation as we have done here.

The statement that a (I)NS calculus is 'more syntactic' (and hence preferable from a syntactic/proof-theoretic viewpoint) than a labelled sequent calculus by virtue of the formalism seems incorrect in our view. We have seen that every (I)NS calculus is isomorphic to an (LTS) LTSE calculus so these two objects must surely be 'equally' syntactic. Of course, it is possible to construct a labelled sequent calculus whose derivations are *not* LTS or LTSE derivations and then it might be claimed that *that particular calculus* is less syntactic than a (I)NS calculus for that logic, especially if some derivations in the labelled sequent cannot be translated into formulae. Neverthless, the point that we wish to make here is that it is not on the formalism but on its particular instances—i.e. the concrete calculi—that the judgement should be made of 'more syntactic' or 'less'.

Any modal logic whose corresponding frame condition is geometric has a labelled sequent calculus (i.e. including frame conditions not corresponding to Geach logics). Which of these logics has an INS calculus? It needs to be checked if the axiom corresponding to the frame condition has an LTSE-derivation. Using the tools of correspondence theory we can envisage the construction of a 'general' LTSE derivation, perhaps starting from the first-order Kracht formulae [1].

References

[1] Blackburn, P., de Rijke, M., Venema, Y.: Modal logic, Cambridge Tracts in Theoretical Computer Science, vol. 53. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge (2001)
[2] Brünnler, K.: Deep sequent systems for modal logic. In: Advances in modal logic. Vol. 6, pp. 107–119. Coll. Publ., London (2006)
[3] Dyckhoff, R., Negri, S.: Proof analysis in intermediate logics. Arch. Math. Log. 51(1-2), 71–92 (2012)
[4] Dyckhoff, R., Negri, S.: Geometrization of first-order logic. The Bulletin of Symbolic Logic 21, 123–163 (2015)
[5] Fitting, M.: Cut-free proof systems for Geach logics. The IfCoLog Journal of Logics and their Applications 2, 17–64 (2015)

[6] Fitting, M.: Proof methods for modal and intuitionistic logics, Synthese Library, vol. 169. D. Reidel Publishing Co., Dordrecht (1983)
[7] Fitting, M.: Prefixed tableaus and nested sequents. Ann. Pure Appl. Logic 163(3), 291–313 (2012)
[8] Fitting, M.: Nested sequents for intuitionistic logics. Notre Dame Journal of Formal Logic 55(1), 41–61 (2014)
[9] Gabbay, D.M.: A general filtration method for modal logics. Journal of Philosophical Logic 1(1), 29–34 (1972)
[10] Galatos, N., Jipsen, P.: Distributive residuated frames and generalized bunched implication algebras (To appear)
[11] Gentzen, G.: The collected papers of Gerhard Gentzen. Edited by M. E. Szabo. Studies in Logic and the Foundations of Mathematics, North-Holland Publishing Co., Amsterdam (1969)
[12] Goré, R., Postniece, L., Tiu, A.: On the correspondence between display postulates and deep inference in nested sequent calculi for tense logics. Log. Methods Comput. Sci. 7(2), 2:8, 38 (2011)
[13] Goré, R., Ramanayake, R.: Labelled tree sequents, tree hypersequents and nested (deep) sequents. In: Advances in modal logic. Volume 9. College Publications, London (2012)
[14] Kashima, R.: Cut-free sequent calculi for some tense logics. Studia Logica 53(1), 119–135 (1994)
[15] Marin, S., Strassburger, L.: Label-free modular systems for classical and intuitionistic modal logics. In: AiML 2014. LNCS, Springer (2014)
[16] Mints, G.: Indexed systems of sequents and cut-elimination. J. Philos. Logic 26(6), 671–696 (1997)
[17] Negri, S.: Proof analysis in modal logic. J. Philos. Logic 34(5-6), 507–544 (2005)
[18] Olivetti, N., Pozzato, G.L.: Nested sequent calculi and theorem proving for normal conditional logics: The theorem prover NESCOND. Intelligenza Artificiale 9(2), 109–125 (2015)
[19] Poggiolesi, F.: A purely syntactic and cut-free sequent calculus for the modal logic of provability. The Review of Symbolic Logic 2(4), 593–611 (2009)
[20] Ramanayake, R.: Inducing syntactic cut-elimination for indexed nested sequents. In: Automated Reasoning - 8th International Joint Conference, IJCAR 2016, Coimbra, Portugal, June 27 - July 2, 2016, Proceedings. pp. 416–432 (2016)
[21] Restall, G.: Comparing modal sequent systems, `http://consequently.org/papers/comparingmodal.pdf`
[22] Straßburger, L.: Cut elimination in nested sequents for intuitionistic modal logics. In: FOSSACS 2013, Rome, Italy, March 16-24, 2013. pp. 209–224 (2013)
[23] Tiu, A., Ianovski, E., Goré, R.: Grammar logics in nested sequent calculus: Proof theory and decision procedures. In: Advances in Modal Logic 9, papers from the ninth conference on "Advances in Modal Logic," held in Copenhagen, Denmark, 22-25 August 2012. pp. 516–537 (2012)
[24] Viganò, L.: Labelled non-classical logics. Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht (2000), with a foreword by Dov M. Gabbay